




DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

APR 2 1983



TOWN OF CHAUTAUQUA

Rollman Town Office Building • 11 South Erie Street •

RECEIVED

APR - 7 1993

Mayville, New York 14757
FCC MAIL ROOM

Ms. Donna Searcy, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street NW Room 222
Washington DC 20554

RE: FR DOCKET NO. 92-235 OPPOSITION TO DOCKET

Dear Ms. Searcy:

As an end user of public safety and/or special emergency frequencies, I would like to voice my opposition to "spectrum re-farming", as outlined in notice of proposed rule making #92-235. While public safety interests are unique from other spectrum users due to the public safety considerations, this distinction is not addressed in this proposal. Some major points of concern are listed below.

The possibility of having to replace existing equipment and expand the number of transmitter sites puts a tremendous fiscal burden on the governmental entities. These agencies cannot expect to bear this extra financial burden in this time of budget cutbacks.

Power limitations based on height above average terrain and fifty mile separations are not practical in public safety applications where a specific geopolitical area must be covered.

There is no provision for mutual aid and inter agency operations. Such operations form the backbone of emergency communications.


There is also no provision for eliminating potential interference from existing Canadian stations.

The time table for implementation of narrow channel spacing will not be effective unless all stations change system standards simultaneously. This, in reality, is impossible. There are also many questions pertaining to frequency coordination.

Technical standards necessary to support this proposal do not address a cost effective method of modifying existing equipment. There is evidence of problems with poor voice quality, tone squelch decoding, data transmission, and tone signaling. Tone signaling is the main method of alerting in public safety communications and replacement of existing equipment would be financially prohibitive.

Considering the many financial and technical reasons for the public safety community to oppose these regulations, and the potential compromise of the public's safety, I request that the commission withdraw this notice of proposed rule making #92-235.

Sincerely,



TOWN OF CHAUTAUQUA

Rollman Town Office Building • 11 South Erie Street

RECEIVED

APR 2 1993

FCC MAIL ROOM
May 1993, New York 14757

Ms. Donna Searcy, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street NW Room 222
Washington DC 20554

RE: PR DOCKET NO. 92-235 OPPOSITION TO DOCKET

Dear Ms. Searcy:

As an end user of public safety and/or special emergency frequencies, I would like to voice my opposition to "spectrum re-farming", as outlined in notice of proposed rule making #92-235. While public safety interests are unique from other spectrum users due to the public safety considerations, this distinction is not addressed in this proposal. Some major points of concern are listed below.

The possibility of having to replace existing equipment and expand the number of transmitter sites puts a tremendous fiscal burden on the governmental entities. These agencies cannot expect to bear this extra financial burden in this time of budget cutbacks.

Power limitations based on height above average terrain and fifty mile separations are not practical in public safety applications where a specific geopolitical area must be covered.

There is no provision for mutual aid and inter agency operations. Such operations form the backbone of emergency communications.

There is also no provision for eliminating potential interference from existing Canadian stations.

The time table for implementation of narrow channel spacing will not be effective unless all stations change system standards simultaneously. This, in reality, is impossible. There are also many questions pertaining to frequency coordination.

Technical standards necessary to support this proposal do not address a cost effective method of modifying existing equipment. There is evidence of problems with poor voice quality, tone squelch decoding, data transmission, and tone signaling. Tone signaling is the main method of alerting in public safety communications and replacement of existing equipment would be financially prohibitive.

Considering the many financial and technical reasons for the public safety community to oppose these regulations, and the potential compromise of the public's safety, I request that the commission withdraw this notice of proposed rule making #92-235.

Sincerely,

James R. Wilcoxson
Councilman